LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 172
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

The Evolution of Sex

Clement Wood

LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 172
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

The Evolution of Sex

Clement Wood

HALDEMAN-JULIUS COMPANY
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1924,
Haldeman-Julius Company

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter I. Reproduction Without Sex	5
The Origin of Life	5
The Origin of Mind	7
Reproduction Is Nutrition	8
The Female Sex Primary	8
Sex Is Not Reproduction	10
Asexual Reproduction: Division	11
Same: Budding	11
Same: Germinal Budding	11
Same: Spore Formation	11
Same: Virgin Reproduction	13
Chapter II. Origin of the Male Sex	15
Function of Fertilization	15
Compound Reproduction	17
Male and Female Cells	17
Origin of the Male Sex	19
Pocket Husbands	20
Sex Among Plants	22
Chapter III. Female Rule	26
Sexual Selection	26
Male Efflorescence	29
Primitive Woman	31
Female Rule	33
Chapter IV. Male Rule	37
Fatherhood Unknown	37
The Couvade	38
Man-Rule	41
Subjection of Women	42
Chapter V. Women Under Male Rule	45
The Family	45
Marriage	46
Psychology of Rape	49
Male Sexual Selection	50
Women in History	51
Woman's Achievements	53
Chapter VI. Toward the Future	54
Development of Love	54
Women Today	57
The World We Are Leaving	57
Recapitulation	59

THE EVOLUTION OF SEX

CHAPTER I.

REPRODUCTION WITHOUT SEX

The Origin of Life.—Planets, such as our earth, are formed directly by the condensation of gaseous matter, according to the nebular theory; or by the coming together of fragments of exploded starry matter, according to the planetesimal theory. By the more generally accepted nebular theory, as the mass condenses, it contracts. The gaseous elements vary greatly in their degrees of volatility; and some of them, as they cool while radiating heat, become liquid, molten, and at last solid, sooner than others. The heavier substances that condense first occupy the center and general mass of the planet, while the lighter ones that require very low temperatures to become liquid remain at the surface. Some of these, such as nitrogen, do not combine with others, and remain elementary; others, as hydrogen and carbon, combine readily with oxygen. Hydrogen and oxygen in combination form vast masses of steam, which become later vapor, water, and even ice; the planet Jupiter seems to consist largely of vapor. Once our earth had an envelop of steam or vapor as thick as would result from converting all the seas and oceans into vapor. Oxygen and carbon form the gas, at ordinary temperatures, known as carbon dioxide. After the formation of the earth's crust, there re-

mained water occupying the cavities of the surface, and an atmosphere of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon dioxide and watery vapor.

These four are the principal materials out of which the life products are formed. Chemism, or chemical action between elements and compounds, is always occurring; within the narrow range of temperatures bordered by the freezing and the boiling points of water, reaching a maximum near the middle of the scale separating these (50 C., 122 F.), this chemism passed into zoism, or the production of life. We are as sure of this chemical beginning of life as we are of the principal facts of geology. This process may still be going on; or it may have required higher temperatures and different conditions than now exist, to originate our organic world or world of living things. The two characteristics distinguishing life from lifelessness are (1) motility, the power of spontaneous mass motion, and (2) irritability. The simplest product of life is protoplasm, which occupies the middle point between the inorganic and organic worlds. Huxley described it perfectly as the "physical basis of life."

Before the appearance of life, all activity of matter itself, excluding that as the result of external physical stimuli, had been molecular; masses moved only when impelled by the contact of other moving masses. Solid bodies seem motionless, although science has taught that the molecular particles comprising them are in motion. This molecular motion is spontaneous; and, when we have spontaneous mass mo-

tion, as in protoplasm, we have life. Lester Ward, the most distinguished scientist whom America has given the world, suggests that this spontaneous mass motion may be caused by the larger size of organic molecules, moving their mass somewhat as the larva of a moth burrows into a bean, and causes what we call a jumping bean. Whether this analogy will stand or not, we have protoplasm, the lowest living form, produced from chemism under proper conditions, with motility or spontaneous mass motion as its chief distinguishing mark.

The Origin of Mind.—Living matter developed at once, or very early, the property of awareness, consciousness, or feeling—for in their absolute beginnings these three are one. It is not possible to say that the lowest animals, plants, and protoplasm feel; but we know that the elements out of which consciousness emerges are present even in protoplasm. Just as molecular activity is not yet life, so motility is not yet mind. Life, as first produced, was soft, semi-watery, viscid, and gelatinous—the colloid form, as opposed to the crystalloid form found in non-organic matter. The life bodies must remain unstable, so that they might perpetually renew their constituent particles, exhausted by the continuing chemism involved in their activities. The problem was to preserve the form during this change in the substance. The least concussion from without threatened to destroy the life thus built up, and return it to the mineral world. Two great necessities were present from the beginning; to supply the waste involved in metabolism; and

to escape the destructive influences of the environment. To serve this second function, feeling came into existence.

Feeling requires an interest. Our only conceivable basis of interest is agreeableness or its opposite; pleasure, or pain. Nature has other methods of protection: roots, woody coverings, shells. But even in these cases, some degree of feeling is necessary to permit organic progress. And feeling is the seed or first step in the chain whose present link is man's mind.

Reproduction Is Really Nutrition.—No fact in biology is better established than that reproduction represents a specialized mode of nutrition, through a renewal of the organism, which, especially in multi-celled creatures, cannot survive continually. "The process of reproduction," says Haeckel, "is nothing more than a growth of the organism beyond its individual mass." An interesting evidence of this is that the arrest of nutrition hastens reproduction, while abundant nutrition checks, and may even prevent reproduction. The stuffed stomach is too sluggish to love. Individual nutrition continues as long as there is little danger of the organism's being cut off; ultra-individual nutrition, or reproduction, arises when there is danger of the organisms being cut off, and is emphasized by any direct threat to the life of the individual.

The Female Sex is Primary, the Male Secondary, in Life.—Originally and normally all life centers about the female. The male, not necessary to the scheme of life, was developed under the operation of the principle of advan-

tage, to secure organic progress through the crossing of strains. This explanation, staggering under the ponderous title of the Gynaeconcentric or woman-centered theory, is the most impressive contribution to the thought of the world of Lester Ward, the great sociologist who taught so long at Brown University.

Comte saw only that, in the fundamental attribute of the human species, the tendency to make sociability prevail over personality, the woman was superior. Havelock Ellis said, "The female is the mother of the new generation, and has a closer and more permanent connection with the care of the young; she is thus of greater importance than the male, from Nature's point of view." He too refuted the theory that woman was in a state of "arrested development," by showing that the child, and the young generally, represent the most advanced type of development; while the adult male represents a reversion to an inferior early type, which in man means a more bestial type. Bachofen, McLennan, Morgan, and the other ethnologists who studied that remarkable institution or historic phase called the matriarchate, or period of mother-rule in human society, stopped short of seeing the full significance of the phenomena. When Burns says of Nature,

> Her 'prentice han' she tried on man,
> An' then she made the lasses, O,

he exactly reversed the actual development, which was that long after the female had been the race itself, the male developed. Instead of

woman originating as a literal side-issue, a rib from Adam's side, the male originated in a tiny fertilizing organ that grew on an early female's body. So blindly does man misperceive the truth, so slowly does he grow toward a perception of it.

Sex Is Not Reproduction.—Biologists have only recently discovered the principle of sex. The popular error still is that the purpose of sex is to secure reproduction. Paradoxal as it may sound, sex has fundamentally nothing to do with reproduction. The vast majority of the organisms now known to science possess no sex, and yet reproduce asexually in the most prolific manner. What, then, is the purpose of sex? In other words, what office does it perform in the functioning of life? Modern biology answers that sex is a device for keeping up a difference of potential energy in life, by securing variation.

In asexual reproduction, heredity is simple repetition. The structures in existence exactly reproduce themselves. The only variation possible comes through the influence of the environment on the living organism, and not through reproduction at all. Even in plants apparently hermaphroditic, or self-fertilizing, there are a thousand devices for securing cross-fertilization. But for the possibility of cross fertilization by insects, there would have been no flowers in the popular sense; showy and fragrant flowers came into existence simultaneously with nectar-seeking insects. There is a constant tendency in both the vegetable and the animal worlds to escape from asexual re-

production into sexual reproduction, and in the latter to secure the greatest possible separation of the sexes and difference in the parents. The advantage of sexuality is evident. Its purpose is not reproduction, but variation. It must never be forgotten that progress results from the fusion of unlike elements; the function of sex is to secure this progress.

Asexual Reproduction: Division.—The simplest form of reproduction without sex is by division or fission (splitting). This can only occur with a one-celled organism, like the Amoeba. The overgrown Amoeba, moner, or protist, consisting of an apparently homogeneous mass of living protoplasm, falls apart and resolves itself into two nearly equal portions, each of which continues to grow as before, and again divides, and so on indefinitely. Notice that the growth, not the reproduction, of a higher organism is a process very similar to this, occurring as it does through cell-division. But in the Amoeba each cell is an individual; it increases in size and then divides, each cell in turn increasing and again dividing, and so on indefinitely, thus constituting the growth of the whole organism.

Asexual Reproduction: Budding.—The second step in the reproductive process is called budding, or gemmation. The one-celled organism, instead of dividing into two practically equal parts, divides, as we may say, into two very unequal parts. A small portion of its substance protrudes or swells a little, and is then separated from the mother-cell by a constriction that grows deeper and deeper until

the bud becomes wholly detached. This small bud then grows until it attains the size of the parent cell, and at the proper time in its turn develops a bud that has the same life history. This mode of reproduction is not confined to one-celled organism, but takes place in certain worms, Polyzoa or sea-mosses, and Ascidia or sea-squirts. In plants, as everybody knows, it is the principal form of reproduction, the true bud being its type; through it also are produced rootstocks, runners, and stolons, or branches which take root at the tips and develop new plants.

Asexual Reproduction: Germinal Budding.— The third step in the process of reproduction is called germinal budding, or polysporogonia. Within an organism composed of many cells a small group of cells separates from the surrounding ones and gradually develops into an independent individual similar to the parent, and sooner or later finds its way out of the mother. This process of reproduction is met with in some zoophytes or plant-like animals, such as corals, in some worms, and in the Trematodes or flukeworms. These young cell groups of course soon attain maturity, and go through the same process as the parent group.

Asexual Reproduction: Spore Formation.— The fourth step is an intermediate one between germinal budding and the simplest form of bisexual reproduction. It is called germ cell formation or spore formation (monosporogonia, or sporogonia). In this, a single cell, instead of a group of cells, becomes detached from the interior of the organism, but does not

further develop until it has escaped from the latter. It then increases by division, and forms a many-celled organism like its parent. This form of reproduction is common among certain low types of vegetation.

Asexual Reproduction: Virgin Reproduction.—The fifth form of asexual reproduction, parthenogenesis or virgin birth, is not so much a forward step in the reproductive series, as a backward step from a more advanced form. In it, germ cells, similar in appearance to eggs, are capable of developing into new beings without the aid of any fertilizing agent. The same cells may also be fertilized, and upon the fact of fertilization or non-fertilization usually depends the sex of the resulting creature. Among bees, as is well known, the unfertilized eggs produce only males, while the fertilized eggs produce females. This, of course, is not reproduction in the full sense, since without some fertilization the race would be quickly cut off. It is a blind alley in birth. But in certain plant lice, the reverse of this is true; the unfertilized eggs produce females, capable at maturity of repeating the process. Here then is a form of virgin birth, or parthenogenesis, which constitutes complete reproduction. It is believed that it is a weak form of reproduction, and might fail from gradual decline in life energy. In any case, virgin birth produces the drones or male bees, certain female plant lice, and, in certain religious beliefs, heroes, gods, and saviors.

It is probable that there are other asexual steps, not now known to science, intermediate

between some of these. These have either not been studied as yet, or the forms in which they occur have not persisted, and have left no record as yet deciphered. Enough is known to indicate that the reproductive process has been a serial development from simpler to more complicated modes. In fact, as Lamarck said, reproduction at these early stages is nothing but the continuation of the process by which life was originally created, and which could not have continued as a permanent fact without it. The origination of life, the preservation of life (nutrition, growth), and the continuation of life (reproduction) are all one fact, and the observed differences are only matters of detail.

CHAPTER II.

ORIGIN OF THE MALE SEX

The Function of Fertilization.—Reproduction has for its sole object to perpetuate life. To enable the individual to attain its maximum size, to live out its normal period of existence, to carry itself on into new beings that will do the same, and to produce as large a number as possible of such beings—these are the primary ends of nature in the organic world. But this purely quantitative development was not all that the life force accomplished; there was added to it a qualitative development. Here as elsewhere, however, quality is easily reducible to quantity. Quantity remained the end, and quality served primarily as a means. The end of nature, as far as science has been able to estimate, has been the increase of the quantity of matter transferred from the inorganic to the organic state. Anything additional to this is to be classed among the incidental, extra-normal, and "unintended" results.

A relatively slow increase in quality results from that process which Darwin called natural selection; Spencer, the survival of the fittest; and Ward, most aptly of all, the elimination of the wayward. This came from slow alterations in the organism caused by the influence of the environment, which alterations were inheritable. But nature sooner or later sought a speeding up of this process. With the life force pushing in all conceivable directions, as from

the center toward every point on the surface of a sphere, every possible process must have been tried. Life functions like an exploding shell; and any direction where the environment permitted continuing travel, would be followed.

The one advantageous process developed is the process or principle of cross fertilization. Mere reproduction continues the type unchanged, except by sluggish environmental changes; heredity is repetition. The word sex is used loosely to describe even the earlier states of cross fertilization. From this standpoint, sex is a dynamic principle of biology, arising gradually from the advantage it afforded in securing the commingling of the ancestral elements of heredity. Its value as a device for maintaining a difference of potential energy depends upon the degree of completeness that it attains. The true meaning of sex is not that of securing or perfecting reproduction; it is the secondary effect of securing variation, and through variation the production of higher types of organic structure—in a word, of speeding up organic evolution.

"Fertilization and reproduction," says Curtis, "are phenomena which may be found together, but which in their essence have no connection with one another. All organisms effect their reproduction in a common way by means of single cells which have arisen by cell division. In single-celled organisms every cell-division is an act of reproduction. In many-celled animals only certain cell-divisions serve for reproduction. Fertilization goes side by side with

reproduction, because the organism cannot attain its highest development without the union of two individualities by nuclear copulation."

Compound Reproduction.—Above the forms of asexual reproduction listed comes compound reproduction. In the one-celled Protozoa the whole organism is involved, while in the Metazoa only the specialized reproductive cells are involved. But in both there are always two cells that unite and coalesce to form the new being. It must be noticed that such conjugation does not imply, primarily or necessarily, any such difference in the uniting cells as is implied by the term sex. The biologists sometimes express this by saying that the sexes were originally alike, or that primarily the sexes were not differentiated. It is more correct to say that at first the cells were not differentiated into male and female at all.

Male and Female Cells.—Fairly early in the process we arrive at cells which are differentiated, one being commonly larger and motionless, and the other smaller and active; and this differentiation may properly be called sexual. There must be some innate interest in the cells to insure their copulation. Ward says that the law of parsimony, or nature's economy, would naturally restrict this interest chiefly to one of the cells, and leave the other passive; and that the same causes created the other differences, including that of size. There is the additional fact that the portion of the cell separating off asexually by division or budding contained not only a nucleus capable of developing into the new organism, in most cases,

but also enough nutriment to support the young organism, to tide it over until it could absorb its own nutriment from air, water, soil, or organic matter. Thus it had to bear a load of nutriment, which increased its size and made it less able to move about. There was no necessity for the fertilizing male cell to bear this nutriment, since its purpose was not reproduction, but hereditary variation. The root of the difference between the sexes is found here.

The result is that the male or sperm cell is usually a relatively minute cell possessing a form approaching that of a body of least resistance, provided with locomotive appendages, and endowed with an appetitive faculty by which it actively seeks the female cell, and buries itself in its substance. The female cell is comparatively large and passive.

Since asexual generation seems ultimately to exhaust itself, it is found in exclusive form today in only a few organisms. Much more frequently there is found that modification of it called alteration of generations, in which after a long series of asexual reproductions the creature goes through a resting period, usually encysted or enclosed in a protective covering, which is followed by conjugation or some form of cross fertilization, the resulting progeny again reproducing asexually, and so on. As we mount up the scale of life, these periods of asexual reproduction grow shorter and shorter, until they are at last eliminated entirely. Since fertilization has originally nothing to do with reproduction, it was a long step to the point

where it became, through its advantage to the race, necessary to reproduction.

Origin of the Male Sex.—Biologists speak of mother-cells and daughter-cells, even in asexual reproduction. And this is reasonable, since the female is the fertile sex, and whatever is fertile is looked upon as female. It would be absurd to look upon an organism propagating asexually as male. We may then say that life begins with the female organism, and is carried on a long distance by means of females alone. In a word, life begins as female.

The female sex, which existed from the beginning, continues unchanged; the male sex, which did not exist at the beginning, makes its appearance at a certain stage, has a certain history and development, but never becomes universal. There are probably many more living beings without it than with it, even in the present life of the globe. The female is the primary and original sex, and continues throughout as the main trunk; the male element was added afterwards for purposes of variation. The male is, therefore, a mere afterthought of nature. Moreover, for a long period the male sex was originally, and still is throughout many of the lower orders of beings, devoted exclusively to the one function for which it was created, that is, fertilization. Among millions of humble creatures, the male is simply and solely a fertilizer.

We arrive, after this long session with females only, at the first male. The simplest type of sexuality consists in the continuance of the original female form, with the addition

of an insignificant and inconspicuous male fertilizer, incapable of any other function. The commonest differentiation between the cells of the two sexes is size. In the human species, for example, the ovum (egg or female cell) is 3,000 times as large as a spermatazoon (male cell). Among some forms of life, the ovum is 100,000 times as large as the spermatazoon. Let the male take what comfort he can out of being at times only one-hundred-thousandth of the size of the female.

Pocket Husbands.—Among the Cirripedia, or barnacles and acorn-shells, Darwin discovered that the female had in two valves of her shell two little pockets, in each of which she kept a little husband. Any female of another species has at times seven of these little husbands attached to herself; and, in addition, is hermaphroditic, or well equipped to fertilize herself. Among the Nematoidea, or round-worms and thread-worms, the males have no stomach; the entire visceral cavity is occupied by the testicles; Darwin could not discover in them any trace of digestive organs. The husband is merely a testicle living on the female. These extreme cases are valuable, in that they show how sexuality began; they give us a picture of the first male.

Female superiority, of more or less marked degree, prevails throughout the greater part of the invertebrates. It is perhaps greatest among the Arachnidae or spider family. The relatively gigantic female almost invariably seizes and devours her tiny male fertilizer while he is seeking to do the only duty he ex-

ists for. This is not an anomaly in nature, but quite natural and normal in the slow evolution of the sexes. In the mantis, or praying insect, the male is larger than among most spiders; but the ferocity of the female is so great, that the male runs terrible risks in securing a mating, usually resulting in his destruction. In copulation, the female usually bites and consumes an entire leg, an eye, another leg, the head, and commences gnawing on the body, before the male has achieved mating. When she rests, after eating practically all of the thorax, the male's persistence is rewarded, and copulation takes place. The headless, almost bodiless, male, a few hours later, is entirely eaten by his ferocious wife. It is only by accident that a male ever escapes alive from the embraces of his partner.

In insects generally the males are smaller than the females, especially in the imago or final perfect state. Among many families the male, usually smaller and slenderer, has no functional organs for eating, or has these so imperfectly developed that he cannot sustain life beyond the period that the nourishment stored up in the larval state will continue it. The sole function of such males is fertilization. Often the male mosquito does not take any nourishment. Among bees, the males, known as drones, are killed off remorselessly by the females, or workers, if they become numerous.

Among low vertebrates we still find female superiority. In the smallest known vertebrate, *Heterandria formosa*, the killifish, half an inch long, which abounds in Florida waters, the fe-

male is a third again as large as the male. Male fishes are commonly smaller than female. In trout this is well known, and trout fishermen sometime throw the little males or "studs" back into the stream, as not worth taking. Among birds, in the hawk family, the female is usually the larger and finer bird. Among some mammals this is true; the great family of rodents, the hedgehogs, and others, show no superiority of the male.

Sex Among Plants.—We have dealt first with animals; but the first animal could not come, as the naturalist J. Otis Swift points out, until some plant turned cannibal, and began to eat other plants. For the broadest distinction between plant and animal is that the plant can take its nutriment from the inorganic chemicals in the soil, while the animal must feed upon organic products. With the simplest plants, the reproduction is much the same as among the simplest animals, which, indeed, can scarcely be distinguished from the simplest plants. Taking the whole higher plant as the unit, we have three grades of sexuality: 1, hermaphroditism, in which both male and female organs occur in the same flower; (2), monoecism, in which the flowers are either male or female, but both sexes occur on the same plant; and, (3), dioecism, in which every plant is either wholly male or wholly female. Among flowerless plants, such as pteridophytes (ferns, club-mosses, horse-tails), bryophytes (mosses and Hepaticae or liverworts), and thallophytes (bacteria, algae, and fungi), the sexual cells are borne in a variety of ways, usually widely sep-

arated, often on different plants. Here, after the brief prothallium or true sexual stage, occurs the lengthening spore-bearing or principal stage in the life of the plant. An extended study of this belongs to the science of botany.

The great families of cycads and Gingkoaceae (Japanese maiden-hair tree), apparently transition forms among flowering plants, are both relatives of the ferns, and are fertilized by means of spermatazoids—active ciliated sperm cells—as in the case of flowerless plants. All other flowering plants, as far as now known, have the entire prothallium stage absent, abridged, or condensed into the development of the ovule and pollen grain. In plants, hermaphroditism, or the presence of both sexes in the one organism, is not the anomalous and almost pathologic condition known in the animal world; it seems to have been the initial state in flowering plants. Deviation from it is the result of nature's universal struggle to prevent self or close fertilization, and to secure the widest possible separation of the sexes. From the more scientific standpoint, that the individual is not the entire plant, but the growing branch, this is not hermaphroditism at all, but simply the bringing together of the sexes in compact and somewhat systematically organized groups; for this was the only way that fertilization could be brought about, before the coming of nectar-bearing insects. The longer a type has lived, the wider is the separation of the sexes. The influence of cross fertilization through insect agency is chiefly upon plants with hermaphroditic flow-

ers. If we regard male stamens and female pistils as individuals, it becomes clear that in the higher plants generally, and to a far greater extent than among animals, the male is simply a fertilizer, while the female goes on and develops and matures the fruit. Stamens always wither as soon as the anthers have shed their pollen. They have no other function.

If we regard the whole plant as the individual, it is instructive to look at the dioecious plants, which bear male and female flowers on separate plants. Among such plants there are cases of female superiority, never of male superiority. The best known example is the hemp plant, *Cannabis sativa*. When hemp is sown in a field, the sexes cannot at first be distinguished. This condition continues until the plants reach the period of fertility. The male plants then shed their pollen, and the females are thereby fertilized. Soon thereafter, if the field is crowded, the male plants cease to grow, turn yellow and sere, and in a short time droop, wither, die, and disappear. The female plants have not yet reached their maximum development; they grow taller and more robust, as the fruit swells and ripens. In loosely sown fields the male plants do not die at once, but cease their growth, and live weakly to the end of the season. In *Antennaria plantaginifolia* and other dioecious plants the patches of male plants form a mat or carpet on the ground, the flowering stems only a few inches above the root leaves; the female patches are less dense, and the flower-bearing stems, after fertilization, often grow more than a foot high.

All these facts from both kingdoms, (and an unlimited number of additional examples might be cited), combine to show that the female constitutes the main trunk, descending unchanged from the asexual, or presexual, condition; that the male element was added at a certain stage for the sole purpose of securing a crossing of ancestral strains, and the consequent variation and higher development; that the male began as a simple fertilizer, adapting a variety of forms; that the male, for reasons to be given, in most organisms gradually assumed more importance, and at last approached the size and general nature of the female; but that throughout almost the whole of invertebrates, and to a considerable extent among the vertebrates, the male has remained an inferior creature, devoting its existence to the one function for which it was created. The change, or progress, has been wholly in the male; the female has remained unchanged. The female represents heredity, and the male variation. The female is not a case of arrested development; she represents the normal condition, while the male in his variability is to that extent abnormal. Females represent what Goethe calls "the stubborn power of permanency."

CHAPTER III.

FEMALE RULE

Sexual Selection.—Thus we have the picture of the two sexes: the female, one long procession, constant in size and importance; the male, absent for a long stretch, commencing as a small fertilizing agent, with no other function, and gradually evolving to equal place with the female, and at times a higher position. What should surprise the intelligent is not that the female is usually superior to the male; but that the male should have advanced at all beyond his primitive estate as a fertilizing agent attached to the female, or at most as a minute organism detached from her but devoted exclusively to the same purpose. Female superiority is a natural condition; male development requires explanation.

We have seen that an innate interest must be in the male, to insure his performing his biologic function of fertilization. This biologic imperative commands him, in season and out of season, always and under all circumstances, to do his fertilizing duty, and never on any pretext to allow an opportunity to escape to infuse into the old hereditary trunk of his species, the female, the new life that is in him. This duty he always performs, with extraordinary efforts, extraordinary risks, and at times at the cost of his life. Sexual irregularities in human society are chiefly due to this same principle. All attempts on the part of

society to regulate the relations of the sexes, necessary though they be to the maintenance of the social order, interfere with the biologic principle of crossing strains and securing the maximum variation, development and vigor of the stock. The violation of human laws relating to this class of conduct is usually in obedience to that higher law of nature commanding such conduct.

In the economy of nature, the sacrifice of males was a matter of complete indifference, as much so as the sacrifice of germs, because the supply of males was inexhaustible. Throughout the lower orders an excess of males over the females is the normal condition. That a hundred males should live and die without once exercising their normal faculty is of less consequence than that one female should go unfecundated. Biologic economy consists in unlimited resources coupled with the multiplication of chances.

The interest of the male is obviously wholly unlike the interest of the female. She has to a limited extent the sexual desire of the male; but this is not usually strong enough to cause her even to move from her place, much less seek the male, under normal conditions. From this point of view she is comparatively indifferent, and is, as is so commonly said, the passive sex. Her burden is to hold in her ovum the nutriment for the young nucleus, sufficient for the period before it can secure its own nutriment; this makes her passive. Male variation may be retrogressive, as well as progressive; excessive variation may lead to

abnormalities. Thus the female, as the regulator of the process, is the balance wheel of the whole machinery. As the ancestral trunk she stands unmoved amid the heated strife of rivals, and holds the scales that decide their relative worth to the race. Nature says to the male: fecundate! but to the female: discriminate! To the male: cross the strains! to the female, choose the best! Herein the value of the plurality of males appears. In such a plurality there are always differences. The female recognizes these differences, and instinctively selects the male that has the highest value for the race.

The subjective feeling of preference, which grew early in the female by organic adaptation, is the distinctive interest of the female. It is wanting in the plant and in the lower animals, but appears soon in the history of sentient beings. It represents the dawn of the esthetic or artistic faculty. This discrimination of the female soon gave rise to changes in the male, especially those alterations known as secondary sexual characteristics. Thus, as in the case of spiders and other families where the male is much smaller, the first standard of choice was (1) greater size in the male. In the mollusks, the bivalved shell-fish, hermaphroditism prevails; the male is simply a fertilizing organ, and not a separate organism; but the tendency toward sex separation is general. In the Arthropods and Arachnids (spiders) occur the enormous differences in size we have considered; among all insects there is some difference of size. The process

of selection for size culminates in the abnormal case of a seal, *Callorhinus ursinus*, where the grown male weighs six times as much as the grown female. Among insects, other more striking and apparently abnormal facts, such as brilliant coloration, peculiar markings, special ornamental organs, and weapons of destruction, enter into the choice. These constitute (2) male efflorescence.

Male Efflorescence.—We have seen the birth of the male being, long after that of the true organism, in the form of a minute sperm-plasm to supplement the much older germ-plasm, not as an aid to reproduction, but simply as a medium of variation. The esthetic discrimination of the female, after having elevated through slow evolution the size of her mate, proceeded to produce many beautiful objects in the form of male decoration in invertebrates, lower vertebrates, and especially among birds. The marvelous beauty of tho male birds of paradise, the exquisite colors and markings of butterflies, moths, and beetles, ostrich feathers and peacock tails, evidence this female artistic quality. A third element of choice was for what may be called (3) moral qualities, such as courage. This is a special element of success, and its development led to the universal rivalry in the animal world for mates. The battles of the males rarely result fatally; the battles are often in reality mock battles. Nor do the strongest and ablest males force the females into submission; there is no forcing of females until we get to the human race. The female, even when greatly sur-

passed in size and strength by the male, still asserts her supremacy, and exercises her right of choice as sternly and pitilessly as when she far surpassed the male in these qualities.

A common falsehood is that the so-called "superior" males among animals devote their new-gained strength to the work of protecting and feeding the female and the young. Those male birds and mammals in which the process of male differentiation has gone furthest, such as peacocks, pheasants, turkeys, barnyard fowls, lions, buffaloes, stags, and sheep, do practically nothing for their families. It is the mother, and she alone, that cares for the young, feeds them, defends them, and if necessary fights for them. It is she who has the real courage—courage to attack the enemies of her species. Many wild animals will flee from man, the only exception being the female with her young. She alone is dangerous. Even the male lion is really somewhat of a coward; but the hunter learns to beware of the lioness. The doe goes off into a lonely spot to bring forth and nurse her fawn. It is much the same with the female buffalo and the domestic cow. How much does the bull or the cock care for its mate or its offspring? Approach the flock, and the cock retreats strategically, while the old hen ruffles up her feathers so as to look formidable, and dares to attack the intruder. The cock's business is with other hens, that have no chickens to distract their attention from him.

The formidable weapons of male animals, acquired through sexual selection, are employed

exclusively in fighting other males, and never in the serious work of fighting enemies. The female looks on and admires the victorious rival, and selects him to continue the species. The whole phenomena of so-called male superiority bears a certain stamp of spuriousness and sham. It is to natural history what chivalry is to human history. It is pretentious, meretricious, quixotic; a sort of make-believe, play, or sport of nature of an airy unsubstantial character. The male side of nature shot up and blossomed out in an unnatural, fantastic way, cutting loose from the real business of life, and attracting a share of attention wholly disproportionate to its real importance. Ward aptly calls this male efflorescence. It certainly is not male supremacy, for throughout the animal world below man, in all the serious and essential affairs of life, the female is still supreme. There is no male ruling. Its chief value lies in the fact that in lifting the male from nothing to his present estate, it has lifted all species and all life, and placed the organic world on a higher plane.

Primitive Woman.—In the larger apes that most resemble man, male efflorescence is tolerably well marked, although not so extreme as in some other animals. Certain tailed apes, mandrils, seacats, and nose-apes, resemble man facially more than the great anthropoid or tailless apes; and the males here have a true beard like that of man. Darwin correctly points out that about at this stage nudity was developed as a secondary sexual characteristic, as being more attractive than the hairy

covering. Abnormal hirsute display marked the male; the beard is the most prominent and typical secondary sexual characteristic of man.

In all known human races, man is found to be larger and stronger than woman. A survey of this field soon shows that we are on a new plane of existence. We have reached another of those turns in the lane of evolution, at which a new era begins. It is one of those cosmic crises, in which a new and at first unperceived and unimportant element suddenly assumes vast proportions, and causes a complete change of front in the march of events. We have encountered such before. The rise of the esthetic or artistic faculty among females, which led to sexual selection, evolve the male sex, and carried it up to such giddy heights, was one of these cosmic crises; on the human plane we encounter another such element, the presence in man of a reasoning faculty. This faculty alone gave man the dominion of the earth; the same faculty, as we shall see, gave man in the narrower sense the dominion of woman.

By reasoning or the rational faculty it is not meant that primitive man was able to reason well about everything, or was incapable of an unreasonable act; it merely means that he was a being capable of reasoning about the simplest and most material things. Now (4) increased brain mass became a secondary sexual characteristic. Over and above such masculine ornaments as horns, spurs, bright colors, and musical powers, the strife for female favor

became more and more dependent upon sagacity or shrewdness, and this led to masculine brain development. Already larger and physically stronger than woman, man's egoistic reason, unfettered by any such sentiment as sympathy, and therefore wholly devoid of moral conceptions of any kind, naturally led him to employ his superior strength in exacting from woman whatever satisfaction she could yield him. The first blow that he struck in this direction wrought the whole transformation. The power and badge of the female sex had been from the beginning her power of choice. This reasoning man early set about wresting from woman; and though this was not accomplished all at once, it was accomplished very early, and for the mother of mankind all was lost for dreary dark ages.

Female Rule.—In a broad general sense, the relations of the sexes throughout the animal kingdom might be characterized as a gynaecocracy, or female rule. Bachofen, Ward, and others restrict the term to the primitive human race. This phase of the early history of man was long unknown, and indeed unsuspected; it is today firmly established. It must not be forgotten that the true beginnings of man are not known, in the sense that races still existing wholly represent such beginnings. The lowest races known are relatively far advanced, and belong to old stocks. At lower stages than any of these represent, woman, to the same extent as among female anthropoids, possessed absolute power of choice and rejection, and in this most vital respect was

the ruling sex. Woman's surrender of this scepter was a gradual thing. Nothing is more varied than the relations of the sexes among existing races of men. Almost every conceivable form of mating or union has been found; present-day forms of marriage, as ethnology has long established, are purely formal and conventional.

About the time that the transformation from apehood to manhood took place, the males were doubtless larger and stronger than the females, but the females compelled the males to conform to their choice. As the reasoning faculty was acquired by both sexes, though perhaps in somewhat unequal degrees, if it was to cause one sex to dominate the other, circumstances must decide, at least at first, which should be the dominant sex. As the female sex had thus far exercised supremacy in the most vital matters, it might be supposed that woman would prove the dominant sex in primitive hordes. Nor is this supposition apart from the truth, as revealed by the survivals of primitive customs, and the condition of the lowest existing races.

The most striking group of facts establishing this may be called collectively amazonism, in its varied forms. Phenomena of this class, sufficient to show a greater or less degree of female supremacy, have been observed in at least a score of living races, including the natives of the Khasi Hills in Assam; Nairs of the Malabar coast; Dyaks of Borneo; Batta people in Sumatra; Dahomans, West Africa; Mombuttus, Central Africa; natives of Madagascar;

inhabitants of Imohagh in the desert of Sahara; natives of New Britain (Neu-Pommern), Australasia; Fuegians; Botocudus of Eastern Brazil; Indians of the province of Cueva, Central America. This list, of course of remote outlying peoples, covers a large part of the world. That it was once far more general is proved by records of it even in Europe, notably among the ancient Bretons and Scots. Probably each race has passed through the stage, perhaps at relatively different periods and points in their development.

The other principal group of facts supporting primitive female rule is that relating to the matriarchate, motherright, Mutterrecht, or mother-government. Bachofen in 1861 announced that the ancient laws and records, both written and hieroglyphic, indicated a widespread system of descent and inheritance in the female line among both Aryan and Semitic peoples. Soon afterwards McLennan independently discovered that a large number of existing uncivilized races still reckon through the female line, and actually have a more or less complete system of motherright. Morgan, in his great studies of the American Indians, discovered the same thing, complicated by group marriages. The Bible, despite numerous editings from the androcentric or mancentered standpoint, in at least three places points to a primitive Semitic matriarchate, as Bebel points out. Thus Genesis 2:24, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh." This indicates that the man on marriage joined the wife's clan,

and opposes Gen. 3:16. Matthew 19:5; Mark 10:5; Ephesians 5:31 all repeat this matriarchal wording. Numbers 32:41 calls Jair a son of Manasseh and an heir of that tribe, although his father was from Judah, and his mother from Manasseh. Nehemiah 7:63 calls the children of a priest who had married a daughter of Barzillai the children of Barzillai. So hard it is wholly to sponge out all the facts contradicting a later and erroneous theory of history.

CHAPTER IV.

MALE RULE

Ignorance Regarding Fatherhood.—The animal origin of man is now universally admitted by all well-informed persons; but the recognition of its full meaning comes tardily. No blame ever attaches to the sexual relations of animals. They are usually or always such as best subserve the needs of different species; at least they are such as the conditions actually produced. It was the same with man when he emerged from the animal state; properly viewed, they have always been since that date. Animals, contrary to common belief, do not reproduce and rear their young by a conscious attention to this important business. They do not woo and mate for this purpose, and care for their offspring with an eye to the welfare of the species. These functional results are consequences of the law of adaptation, and the agents are unconscious of them as anything to be attached by their actions. They are directed only by feelings. For example, animals have no knowledge of the connection between mating and propagating. All they know is that they like to mate. The female brings forth her young with no conception of the part the male had in it. She cares for her young because she has an innate interest, that is, because she likes to do so. The degree of reasoning power that enabled primitive man to perceive that the fertilization of the male was a necessary condi-

tion to reproduction was not attained until long after full human estate had been reached, and man had advanced far into the protosocial state. There are races still existing which cannot perform this simple act of reasoning; the inability to perform it was once general. Fatherhood was once unknown to early man; there was no glimmer of the idea that the father was related to his own child.

In such a state, it was natural and necessary that everything should be traced to the mother. The father was unknown and unthought of. The idea of paternity did not exist. Maternity was everything. Fertilization and reproduction were as completely separated in thought as they have been shown to be in essence. The gods of this period were, as was to have been expected, female deities. Demeter (dea-mater, god-mother); Cybele, the Great Mother; Asherah or Asheroth, Astarte, Ceres, Latona, Iris, Isis, Frigga, Freya, Gerda and many others date from this time. Amazonism, matriarchy, and all forms of female rule among primitive peoples, instead of being anomalies or curiosities, are simply survivals of this early and long stage in the history of man and society, of which no other evidence exists, but which is the logical and inevitable conclusion that must follow the admission of the animal origin of man.

The Couvade.—At some point quite early in the protosocial stage, it began slowly to dawn upon the growing intellect of man that a causal connection existed between these couplings of men and women, and the birth of children It

was this simple act of reasoning that literally reversed the whole social system. For the first time man perceived that he, too, had a part in the continuance of the race; that the children were in part his, and not wholly the woman's. The idea was, of course, slow to take root. The only certain antecedent to the existence of a child was the parturition of the mother. There could be no doubt that the child came from her. In order that a child might be born, the mother must pass through the throes of child-birth, must suffer pangs, must remain for a greater or less period prostrate and helpless, as if the victim of a disease. The slow savage mind coupled these two ideas, of giving birth and illness, into an indivisible compound conception. The use of fictions by savages is sometimes referred to as an illustration of their ingenuity; correctly analyzed, it proves their incapacity to separate two ideas that habitually occur together. Facts habitually connected cannot be thought of by the savage separately. When their separation is forced upon the savage mind, it invents some fiction which really avoids the necessity of separating them, and still holds them together. Illness and child-birth were two of these facts that had always gone together. The existence of a child must presuppose the temporary illness of the person that has the child. If any one should say to a primitive man, that child is partly yours, he may be imagined to reply, How so? I have not been ill. But when the causal connection became finally generally recognized, he was naturally disposed to assert his claim to the offspring. In

complete promiscuity, no such claim could be set up, even if the fact of paternity was recognized; any one of a large number of men might be the father of the child. But even in primitive hordes, some monogamic or polygynic mating must have taken place, where the male could be certain that no other male had had a shaping part in the birth.

But so firmly did the idea of illness cling to child-birth, that no claim would be regarded as adequate on the part of the man, until this illness had actually been gone through with. Since the father was not made ill by the child-birth, he had to feign the illness, and take to his bed for the prescribed period. Absurd as this may seem, it is what actually takes place among a large number of primitive peoples, in widely separated portions of the world today. This is characterized by Tyler as "the world-wide custom of the 'couvade,' where at child-birth the husband undergoes medical treatment, in many cases being put to bed for days." Letourneau states its significance: "For a long time it was not suspected that the man had anything to do with the pregnancy of the woman. When it began to be suspected, the ridiculous ceremonies of the couvade were invented, by which the man, in recognizing his paternity, sought also to draw upon himself, in part at least, the malevolence of the evil spirits who watched the mother during and after the labor of parturition. In Africa the husband sometimes submits to the ceremony of the couvade in order to reenforce the bonds of parentage with the children of his wife. In many South Amer-

ican tribes the practice of the couvade is observed, which seems to be an effort to create paternal relationship to the child."

Man-Rule.—The idea once firmly established that the family was a joint product of the woman and the man, it is easy to see the important results that would naturally follow. Paternity implied power over the child, which was now exercised by the father as well as the mother. But it went much further. Equal authority with the mother soon led to a comparison of physical strength between the sexes, which had never been made before, for precisely the same reason that the lion never compares strength with the lioness, the bull with the cow, the cock with the hen, and so on. Physical strength never comes in question in a female-ruled state. The female dispenses her favors according to her choice, and the males acquiesce, after venting their jealousy upon one another. The idea of forcing the female never so much as occurs to the primitive male mind. The virtue of the female animal is absolute, for virtue does not consist, as many suppose, in refusal and abstinence, but in selection. The chastity of animals is complete; for chastity is not denial, but choice. It is refusal of the unfit, and of all at improper times and places. The definitions of virtue and chastity apply to human beings, even the most civilized, as well as to animals.

The passage from female rule to male rule was characterized on the part of man by the loss of his normal consideration and respect for the preferences of woman, and on the part

of woman by the loss of her virtue, or power of choice. In discovering his paternity and its accompanying authority, man also discovered his power, which at that stage meant simply physical strength. He began to learn the economic value of woman, and to exert his superior power in the direction of exacting not only favors, but service, from her. The patriarchate or patriarchal system, in which man assumed complete supremacy, was the natural sequel to the process thus begun. The man saw that he was the master creature, that woman was smaller, weaker, less shrewd and cunning than he, and at the same time could be made to contribute to his pleasure and his wants. He proceeded to appropriate her.

The Subjection of Women.—When John Stuart Mill used this expression as the title for his book, he had only the philosopher's penetration into a great truth. We have the light cast by anthropology and biology, and are in better position to realize that this condition, impossible to the so-called brute creation, was a thing only possible among reasoning men.

In our long journey down the stream of life, we have now reached the darkest spot. It would be pleasanter to omit its description; but this would leave a blank in the history. We err if we call man's treatment of woman "brutal"; for no brute mistreats the female, and the abuse of females by males is an exclusively human virtue. Let us see a few pictures from varying parts of the world.

Eyre says, "In Australia little real affection exists between husbands and wives, and young

men value a wife principally for her services as a slave. In fact, when asked why they are anxious to obtain wives, their usual reply is, that they may get wood, water, and food for them, and carry whatever property they possess. Few women will be found upon examination, to be free from frightful scars upon the head, or the marks of spearwounds about the body. I have seen a young woman who, from the number of these marks, appeared to have been almost riddled with spear wounds." Lubbock completes the picture: "The position of women in Australia seems indeed to be wretched in the extreme. They are treated with the utmost brutality, beaten and speared in the limbs on the most trivial provocation. If at all good-looking their position is, if possible, even worse than otherwise." The man, crossed in any desire, found it easy to wreak his anger on his defenseless woman. This is paralleled by modern husbands, who wreak office or work resentments upon wife and children.

Du Chaillu describes two distressing cases of the apparently wanton torture of women in Central Africa, one of which he succeeded in relieving. He suggests that the practice of torturing women was connected with some superstition among the natives, by which women were suspected of sorcery and witchcraft. But how long ago was it that Europe, and even America, tortured women on the same trivial excuse?

"Among the Kaffirs," Spencer quotes Shooter, "besides her domestic duties, the woman has to perform all the hard work; she is her hus-

band's ox, as a Kaffir once said to me; she has been bought, he argued, and must therefore labor." Drury says of a Malagasy chief, "He had scarcely seated himself at his door, when his wife came out crawling on her hands and knees till she came to him, and then licked his feet. All the women in the town saluted their husbands in the same manner." "Almost everywhere in Africa," says Letourneau, "woman is the property of her husband, who has the right to use her as a beast of burden, and almost always makes her work as he does his oxen." Again he says, "In certain Himalayan regions near the sources of the Djemnah in Nepaul, the Aryan Hindoos have adopted Thibetan polyandry. The women are for them veritable merchandise which they buy and sell. At the time of which Fraser writes a woman among the peasants cost from 10 to 12 rupees, a sum which it was pleasant to receive but painful to expend. They also freely sold their daughters, and the brothers of each family bought a common wife, whom they rented without hesitation to strangers."

In New Zealand, according to Moerenhaut, a father or brother, in giving his daughter or sister to her future husband, would say, "If you are not satisfied with her, sell her, kill her, eat her, you are absolute master of her." Civilized wife-beatings and mistreatments, which may be found in our own daily press, differ only in degree from this hideous bestowal.

CHAPTER V.

WOMEN UNDER MALE RULE

The Family. It is customary to speak of the family with the most unreserved respect. Comte, who knew little of primitive man, and whose own family affairs were wretched in the extreme, made it the unit and the bulwark of society. In this he has been followed by many sociologists, and most of those who prefer some other social unit still hold the family to be an essential, if not a sacred institution. But Comte was aware that the word *family* originally meant the servants or slaves. Philologists have traced it back to the Oscan *famel*, from which the Latin *famulus*, slave, proceeded. Only rarely was *familia* used by the Romans except to mean slaves; the word *domus* usually signified the modern family, with parents and children.

Under female rule there could be no proper family. The father was unknown, and the mother cared for the children in obedience to an instinct rooted as far down as certain of the lower vertebrates. With the beginning of male rule, women were enslaved, and women and children became the property of the men. The men fought now to secure as many women for themselves as possible; the weaker men were, as before, condemned to celibacy, and the women were subject to a monopoly of the strong. Solomon had his seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines. This process led to

the patriarchal family. Primitive man-ruled society was thus formed of patriarchal polygamous families, and celibate men, the weaker of whom may also have been made slaves. All women were abject slaves, and the children were compelled to do any service of which they were capable. The patriarchs had absolute power over the persons of all within their families. In Old Testament times, the wife was virtually the property of her husband; the father's power over his children was absolute, even extending to the death penalty and the right to sell his daughter into slavery. A son rebellious to his father and mother, or who cursed them, could be put to death. Nor was the lot of women and children lighter among similar races. Thus the origin of the family was that of an institution for the more complete subjugation and enslavement of women and children, for the subversion of nature's method by which the mother is the queen, dictates who shall be the father, and guards her offspring by the instinct of maternal affection grown there for that purpose. The primitive family was an unnatural man-ruled excrescence upon society.

Marriage. In marriage we find another institution, regarded popularly as a sanctuary, which is in reality another whited sepulchre. The bull may sometimes gently bite his refractory cows; but he never abuses or injures them, much less kills and eats them. That function is reserved for the "lord of creation," man, the only being endowed with a "moral sense," made "in the image of his Creator," and often after his death erected by his descendants into a god.

The word marriage meant originally the causing of a woman to unite with a man, and did not imply her consent at all. The patriarch, who owned all the women, disposed of them as he saw fit. They were looked upon by him as so much value, and if the oxen, spears, boats, or other merchandise offered for a woman were worth more to him than the woman, he sold her for a price. Marriage consisted in nothing more than the ratification, by whatever ceremony might prevail, of the bargain thus made. The whole matter is summed up in the current unflattering joke of the Negro who is said to have swapped his wife for a quart of gin. "I wish I had dat ole 'ooman back," he mourned to a friend.

"Lonely?"

"Naw, thirsty."

In selling a woman to a man, her owner was said to marry her to him, and such was primitive marriage. A great variety of marriages ultimately arose; but all of them wholly ignore the wishes of the woman, and constitute so many different ways of transferring and holding property in woman. Keller describes this in early Greek society: "The characteristic feature of Homeric marriage preliminaries, in perfect consonance with the patriarchal mode, is wife-purchase. Women, that is, concubines, had values set upon them, were given as prizes and bought like cattle; they were mere slaves, and treated as such. A wife, on the other hand, was regularly sought with gifts, that is, bought in a more formal and distinctive way. The father's power was very great; to him the

daughter belonged, and he promised and married her with no thought of her own feeling in the matter." Again Letourneau says, "In the first ages of Rome, the wife forms part of the family of her husband only in the quality of a slave. She was owned like any other chattel; for the virtuous Cato lent his wife Marcia to his friend Hortensius, and took her back on the death of that friend. According to the expression of Monica, Roman marriage was 'only a contract of servitude.' Once married, the woman belonged to her husband, body and goods." It would be hopeless to attempt to list all the forms of marriage; but down to comparatively modern times they all have one thing in common, the proprietorship of the husband in the wife.

Working against this was what may be called the group sentiment of safety, functioning through a ceremonial government, growing more and more ecclesiastical. Its action was not moral, in the sense of lightening the abuse of women by men; it was moral only in the sense of imposing restraints upon tendencies injurious or destructive to the race. Similar enactments lightened the lives of slaves and domestic animals. It was this spirit which dictated, in the English Common Law, that a husband might beat his wife, but must use a stick no thicker than his thumb.

Polygamy, widespread and long-continuing, was almost wholly due to the economic dependence of women. Winiarsky justly remarks, "In regard to prostitution, we have to do with a regular market, recognized for the most part

by states, in which the supply of and demand for woman's virtue exist and in which prices fix themselves according to the law of economic mechanics." Ward says of this, "What would happen if women should acquire economic independence it may be difficult to predict, but it is easy to see that prostitution would practically cease." Economic independence for women is an increasing fact; and as it approaches prostitution, or the sale of a woman's body temporarily, with the vender usually man, is gradually lessening At the same time a limited promiscuity is observably growing more widespread, by no means restricted artificially to a purchasable class of women.

The Psychology of Rape.—At a certain stage rape was a recognized form of marriage, based on the unconscious but universal sense of the advantage of crossing strains, reinforced by the charm of sexual novelty, both motives equally products of the biologic imperative. The philosophy of rape as an ethnological phenomenon is thus briefly summed up by Ward:

1. The women of any race will freely accept the men of a race which they regard as higher than their own.

2. The women of any race will vehemently reject the men of a race which they regard as lower than their own.

3. The men of any race will greatly prefer the women of a race which they regard as higher than their own.

These deep-lying principles, closely analyzed, will be seen to make for race improvement. The difference between female and male selection

may be illustrated more simply. If a number of men start after a female, she will select the fleetest and most fit of them, for he reaches her first; if a man starts after a number of females, he will mate with the most sluggish, that is, with the one whom he is first able to overtake. The first process lifts the race; the second has the opposite tendency. A fourth principle might be added to these:

4. The men of any race, in default of women of a higher race, will be content with women of a lower race.

It remains, of course, that there are occasional perverted cases of women who elect men of a lower race; and of men so self-conscious and unsure of themselves that they elect women of a lower race, bestiality, or another perversion.

Male Sexual Selection.—With the earliest form of social assimilation through conquest, the lowest point seems to have been reached in the moral degradation of man. His inheritance of esthetic as well as intellectual powers gradually worked toward ameliorating his treatment of women. As the lower, more physical wants are supplied, the higher spiritual wants arise, and demand fulfilment.

The earliest male sexual selection at times produced monstrosities, as in the steatopygy of Hottentot women, or an excessive accumulation of fat upon the buttocks of these women, which was the ideal of feminine Hottentot desirability. However, the continued selection of women endowed with health and beauty worked toward lifting the health and beauty of the race. The

two ideals most generally sought for were physical beauty, and physical weakness resulting in an inability to resist the male. This accounts for the preference given to pale waxy complexions, small feet, bound feet in China, and the like. Man did not seek in women mental qualities; hence women were bred down in the direction of imbecility. Nor was he concerned with child-bearing as a prime requisite; there were always other women. Thus a tendency was toward sterility rather than fertility. If the process of male selection had gone on without counteracting forces, we might have had women reduced at last to helpless parasites upon society, comparable to the condition of the primitive male element,—a female corresponding to the early pocket husbands of the barnacles. There are certain women in society now whose functioning is not so great, since they contribute nothing to the quantity nor the quality of the human species. They devote their lives to what Veblen calls a "reputable futility," either as "society" leaders or a certain type of backwater club woman. Of course, their male counterparts are as inutile.

Women in History. The Hebrew myth of the rib has been made a potent instrument for the subjection of women; whereas the fact is that the male came as an insignificant organ on the female body. Paul's teaching was that mating was a degraded thing; to marry was good, not to marry was better. Among the early Christian fathers, Tertullian politely flattered, "Woman, you are the gate to hell," and "Celibacy must be chosen, even though the ha-

man race should perish"—into such extravagant mental suicide error could lead! Hieronymus says that mating is always a vice; Origenes declared that matrimony was impure and unholy, and to escape the temptation he emasculated himself. Peter placed himself in line: "Wives, obey your husbands." The East Indian Book of Manu proceeds in the same man-centered strain; race after race adds similar ignobling counsel. Even today, German, English-Canadian and South European subordination of women are bywords; France and the United States lead in a saner attitude.

Despite their historic subjection, great women have dazzled on the pages of history from the beginning. The goddess of wisdom, Minerva, was a woman. Abstract conceptions, such as Truth, Virtue, Purity, Patriotism, Brittania, Columbia, are usually represented by a woman; New York City's horrendous Civic Virtue, John Bull, and Uncle Sam are examples of the contrary tendency. A Semiramis, a Sappho, a Cleopatra, a Joan of Arc, an Elizabeth, a Catherine the Great, a Victoria, indicate in varying ways the potentiality in women. Le Bon and others have shown that, as we rise in the scale of civilization, the cranial capacities of women and men differ increasingly. The difference in capacity between modern Parisian men and women is double that which existed in ancient Egypt. According to Manouvrier, the cranial capacity of women has diminished from 1442 cubic centimeters in the stone age, to 1338 c. c. today. Yet the lesson to be drawn from this is primarily the degrading influence

of male sexual selection, which has bred down the stock of women mentally, by letting the more thoughtful women go childless, and the moronic baby-dolls mother the race, greatly to the detriment of the human stock.

Woman's Achievements. The wonder is not that there are so few women who have distinguished themselves in a man-ruled society; it is rather that so many have broken through man's straightjacket, and shown the worth of the exiled potentialities. Sappho and Hypatia long ago, George Sand and George Eliot more recently, Rosa Bonheur, the Brontes, Jane Austen, Rachel, Bernhardt, Mary Baker Eddy, Ellen Key, Madame Curie, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Selma Lagerlof, Katherine Mansfield, Sheila Kaye-Smith, Rose O'Neill, to name only a few in varied lines and lands, indicate what we may anticipate from the woman of the future.

CHAPTER VI.

TOWARD THE FUTURE

The Development of Love—Love, the innate interest in the sexes, especially the male, to secure fertilization and the crossing of the strains, and thus organic evolution, appears first as *natural love*, or sheer animal passion. It is the most potent force in human conduct; Freud and his disciple Jung have recently made marvelous strides toward a comprehension of its hidden and universal workings. Carried to an extreme, it defeats its own ends, as in the sects of the Ixcuinames among the ancient Mexicans, and the Areois among the Tahitans and Society Islanders. Under religious sanction these sects practiced complete promiscuity, with infanticide. The first duty of every female member was to strangle her children at the moment of their birth; the mating of each couple lasted scarcely two or three days, and amorous enjoyment was practiced without ceasing. This is an example of the complete triumph of feeling over function, aided even by religious sanction. A celibate priesthood is of course another force working in the same direction, by preventing offspring from a class at times the most cultured and worthy of reproduction. Religion itself has one of its roots deep in the erotic nature of man; the widespread primitive worship of the love force and sexual symbols is evidence of this. The phallic origin of such symbols as cross and trinity, the

yonic derivation of the seven-branched candlestick, are three examples out of hundreds which might be cited, and which are understood by every anthropologist. It must not be forgotten that, in its natural state, natural love is worthy to be called pure and noble. Mysticism is a common byproduct of the suppression of this force. Down to the so-called Age of Chivalry, this was the only form of love generally recognized and practiced.

The savages had no conception of *romantic love*, and neither did the classical world. It grew amid the unnatural conditions of the age of roving knighthood, with its long separation of mated couples, and the danger to isolated highborn women from attacks. Romantic love was a sublimation or emotional substitute for the intense sexual need grown during such absences, and grew in proportion to the greater equality and independence of women during the period. There was often the touch of outlawed love in romantic matings; the romances of great geniuses, Abelard and Heloise, Dante and Beatrice, Petrarch and Laura, Tasso and Eleonora, and a hundred others go to indicate, with the romantic literature of the whole world, that love is a higher law, that will and should prevail over the laws of men and the conventions of society. In this it is in harmony with the teachings of biology and a sound sociology. It differs from natural love primarily in that it is satisfied with the presence, rather than demanding the possession, of the loved one. Of even later growth is *conjugal love*, the love of a man for his wife, or a woman for her hus-

band. This requires monogamy, and a certain strong self-control. It is often at war with romantic love; in certain lands, as generally in France, the two are separated; the wife and mistress are not united in the same person. Society has no more pressing problem than maladjustments due to modern phases of this conflict.

The roots of *maternal love* go down to the beginnings of mammals, or animals which suckle their young; below the mammals, as among birds, instinct is largely responsible for similar manifestations. As women mount in the scale of culture, this power will play a larger part in government, industry, and art. Its individual function practically ceases when puberty has been reached; its selfish continuance thereafter is a triumph of feeling over function, and often prevents or wrecks the marriage of the offspring that are its object. Freud and his followers have located the destructive manifestations of this force misapplied in what they call the Oedipus complex and similar nervous disorders. Widest of all is *love of kindred*, which has grown from the blood-bond uniting the primitive tribal group to such manifestations as patriotism and a growing sense of the brotherhood of man. The three stages of the development of love in the individual, located by Freud as (1) narcism or self-love, (2) homosexuality, and (3) hetero-sexuality, correspond biologically to the three broadest stages in the evolution of sex, (1) asexual reproduction down to conjugation, (2) conjugation of cells and organisms not yet differentiated into male

and female, and (3) sexual congress. An arrested development at any of the preliminary stages causes abnormal and perverted conduct.

Women Today.—The position of woman has altered astonishingly in our culture during the last century. Education has become hers, and some measure of economic independence; the gateways are slowly being pried open to all of the human fields, of industry and art, formerly restricted to men only. This altered and higher position of women is of necessity altering the love relationships. The man-ruled world, in which man has held the vital economic power, the purse-strings, has for a long time decreed monogamy or prostitution for women, and monogamy with prostitution for men. A man could sow a whole field of wild oats; a woman was damned for one oatling. As woman slowly acquires something like an equality with the pursestrings, this ethic is gradually altering in conformity. There is a tendency toward abolishing this double standard, of liberality for man and strictness for woman, and substituting a single standard of monogamy for man as well as woman. This tendency is not wholly acceptable to the innate erotic nature of man, a nature in which woman today to some extent shares, and may increasingly share. A counter-tendency decrees an equal liberality for both sexes, with no blame for liberalizing experiments and experiences in love on the part of either sex.

The World We are Leaving.—We are passing now out of the dreary pages of the world ruled exclusively by men, into a domain mutually

controlled. The three deep-rooted masculine characteristics, desire, combat, and self-expression, which appear with wearying regularity in our politics, laws, arts, sports, education, and all manifestations of our social life, as Charlotte Perkins Gilman has brilliantly pointed out, are slowly being tempered by the protective reticence of woman. Domestic industry, where woman has long been blind-alleyed (and domestic industry is a stage, not a kind, of industry; man's industry was once wholly domestic), is slowly yielding to a more advanced and labor-saving industry for women, in all of their activities. The archaic ideals of broad-shouldered hero and tiny fairy-like heroine, reflected so sickeningly in the romances of several centuries, have been supplanted by a saner desire for a woman neither invalid nor weakling, but a fit mate for a fit man. We have been the only race in which the female depends on the male for a livelihood; and the only race that practices female prostitution. The two travel together, and are leaving together. Religion is passing away from the service to a deity by a choir of mutilated men, praising a male deity no woman may so serve, toward service of a god who does not prefer a eunuch to a woman, if a god must still be served. Emphasis is shifting from minor sexual crimes, which affect man's possession of his woman, into taking account of vast new anti-social crimes, such as poisoning a community with bad food; defiling the water; blackening the air; stealing the forests; working little children; renting disease-breeding tenements;

wholesale lying by the press; planting a poison worse than leprosy in a wife and her unborn child. Punishment itself is yielding to the protective woman's nature, and the future may see a world, guided by woman as well as man, shaping the warped and distorted, thug and pervert and over-accumulator, through tender dealing and firm detention without social intercourse, until he or she is fit again to mingle with a sound society.

Recapitulation.—Worlds, formed of nebulous or planetesimal matter, reach the point where the inorganic matter alters to organic matter, or life, which possesses spontaneous mass motion, in addition to the prior spontaneous molecular motion of inorganic matter. The rudiments of mind develop, as a protective sensitiveness against impacts from the environment. Primitive life, dependent on nutrition, reaches a point where it develops extra-nutrition, or reproduction Originally and normally all life centers about the female. In the lower stages—and more than half of the living organisms are in these stages—the female alone exists, and reproduced without sex by (1) division, (2) budding, (3) germinal budding, (4) spore formation, or (5) virgin birth.

The male then developed, not as an agency of reproduction, but as an agency of fertilization, to secure crossing of the strains, and thus hasten organic evolution. The mating cells (6) at first were not differentiated; but soon a male cell, active, small, and seeking, was developed to fertilize the inactive, large, and passive female cell. In plants especially (7) hermaphro-

ditism, or the presence of both male and female elements in the same body, is common. The true male began as an organism attached to the female body; (8) among the cirripeds, or barnacles, he became a pocket husband, without digestive apparatus, and in reality one large testicle, solely for purposes of fertilization, and either consumed by the female after achieveing his function, or dying shortly thereafter. Among spiders and mosquitoes he has not gone much higher; throughout the insect world female superiority is evident, as among low vertebrates. Male fishes are commonly smaller than female; as high as hawks, rodents, and hedgehogs, the sexes are approximately of the same size.

The female selected the male she wished to mate with her from among a number of males, giving rise in herself to the faculty of esthetic or artistic discrimination. Slow evolution lifted the size of the male from insignificance to equality with the female, and more; and added to him the phenomena of a male efflorescence, or the fantastic coloring and ornamentation, wattles, spurs, beards, and tail-feathers. As we approach man, courage in combat became a secondary male sexual characteristic; and then shrewdness, or excellence in reasoning. The rational mind is thus a byproduct of female sexual selection

Up to this time, the fact of paternity has not been known. Primitive man at length arrived at a comprehension of it, and by the quaint symbol of the couvade, or the husband's feigned illness during his wife's confinement, sought

to establish the father's kinship to his child. Once recognizing this kinship, he sought to control the child; in the resulting strife with the female, he demonstrated his superior physical force over his female, the first time in nature this had been shown, and speedily reduced woman and child to the rank of slaves. Man's agelong subjection of woman followed. Instead of female selection, which tended toward lifting the race stock, male selection took its place, and females were bred toward invalidism, physical beauty, and imbecility. Polygamy and prostitution are byproducts of man's subjection of woman.

In spite of her centuries of degradation, occasionally woman has stepped sensationally to the highest place in the state or the affairs of men. Natural love was supplemented; under man's control, by romantic and then conjugal love; these two are now in process of readjustment. A controlled maternal love and an expanding love of kindred work socially. The present age has witnessed a great step forward in the position of women, intellectually, politically, and humanly. The tendency today is toward a world ruled mutually by man and woman, where sexual choice is a mutual matter. Such joint effort should give a wiser and more joy-producing world than either woman-rule or man-rule alone could produce.

Other Little Blue Books

Biography

5 Life of Samuel Johnson. Macaulay.
393 Life of Frederick the Great. Macaulay.
33 Brann: Smasher of Shams. Gunn.
312 Life and Works of Laurence Sterne. Gunn.
429 Life and Works of Jonathan Swift. Gunn.
522 Life of Thomas Paine. Gunn.
523 Life of Benjamin Franklin. Gunn.
51 Bruno. His Life and Martyrdom. Turnbull.
69 Life of Mary, Queen of Scots. Dumas.
88 Vindication of Paine. Ingersoll.
123 Life of Madame du Barry. Tichenor.
183 Life of Jack London. Tichenor.
323 Life of Joan of Arc. Tichenor.
343 Life of Columbus. Tichenor.
128 Julius Caesar: Who He Was and What He Accomplished.
139 Life of Dante.
141 Life of Napoleon. Finger.
328 Joseph Addison and His Time. Finger.
339 Thoreau: The Man Who Escaped From the Herd. Finger.
394 Boswell's Life of Johnson. Finger.
395 Autobiography of Cellini. Finger.
412 Life of Mahomet. Finger.
537 Life of Barnum: The Man Who Lured the Herd. Finger.
565 Magellan and the Pacific. Finger.
142 Bismarck and the German Empire. Bowlcke.
147 Cromwell and His Times.
227 Keats; The Man, His Works, and His Friends.
236 State and Heart Affairs of Henry VIII.
269-270-271-272 Contemporary Portraits. 4 Vols. Harris.
324 Life of Lincoln. Bowers.
433 Life of Marat. Gottschalk.
438-439 Secret Memoirs of Madame de Pompadour. 2 Vols. Collected and arranged by Jules Beaujoint.
490 Life of Michelangelo (as Seen by Georg Brandes). Moritzen.
506 Life of Voltaire (as Seen by Georg Brandes). Moritzen.
525 Life of Goethe (as Seen by Georg Brandes). Moritzen.
526 Life of Julius Caesar (as Seen by Georg Brandes). Moritzen.
518 The Life and Works of Charles Dickens. Swasey.
521 Life of John Brown. Gold.
666-667 Sarah Bernhardt As I Knew Her. 2 Vols. Dorian.

Drama

(See "Literature (Ancient)" for Greek and Roman Drama. See "Shakespeare" for Shakespearean Plays and Criticism. See "Oscar Wilde." See "French Literature" for Moliere, Victor Hugo and Maeterlinck. See "Ibsen, Henrik.")
90 The Mikado. Gilbert.
226 The Anti-Semites. Schnitzler.
308 She Stoops to Conquer. Goldsmith.
335 The Land of Heart's Desire. Yeats.
337 Pippa Passes. Browning.

371 Empedocles on Etna. Arnold.
378 The Maid of Orleans. Samuels.
383 The Creditor. Strindberg.
384 Four One-Act Plays. Strindberg.
396 Embers. Haldeman-Julius.
406 The Pierrot of the Minute. Dowson.
416 The God of Vengeance. Asch. Translated by Isaac Goldberg.
462 Everyman. A Morality Play.
539 None Beneath the King. Zorrilla. Trans. by Isaac Goldberg.
572 The Beggar's Opera. Gay.
589 The Pot-Boiler. Sinclair.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo

60 Essays on Compensation and Friendship.
179 Gems from Emerson.
423-424-425-426 Representative Men. 4 Vols.
542 Essays on Power and Behavior.
543 Essays on Experience and Politics.
544 Essays on the Poet and Nature.
545 Essays on Character and Manners.
546 Essays on Love, Heroism, and Prudence.
547 Essays on Spiritual Laws and Circles.
548 Essays on History and Intellect.
549 Essays on Nominalist and Realist, Gifts, and the Over-Soul.
550 Essays on Art and Self-Reliance.
551 Essays on Beauty and Worship.
552 Essays on Fate and Illusions.
553 Essays on Wealth and Culture.
338 A Guide to the Philosophy of Emerson. Tichenor.

Essays—(Collections)

(See "Emerson, Ralph Waldo.")
48 Truth, and Other Essays. Bacon.
70 Charles Lamb's Essays.
176 Four Essays. Ellis.
235 Essays. Chesterton.
278 Friendship, and Other Essays. Thoreau.
448 Essays on Montaigne, Pascal and Voltaire. Powys.
449 Essays on Rousseau, Balzac and Hugo. Powys.
450 Essays on De Maupassant, Anatole France and William Blake. Powys.
451 Essays on Remy de Gourmont and Byron. Powys.
452 Essays on Emily Bronte and Henry James. Powys.
453 Essays on Joseph Conrad and Oscar Wilde. Powys.
460 Miscellaneous Essays. Haldeman-Julius.
461 Literary Essays. Haldeman-Julius.
534 Honey and Gall. Powys.

Fiction

21 Carmen. Merimee.
23 Great Stories of the Sea. Cooper, Loti and Marryat.
29 Dreams. Schreiner.
37 Dream of John Ball. Morris.
352 XIIIth Century Prose Tale. Morris.
40 The House and the Brain. Lytton.
41 A Christmas Carol. Dickens.
58 Tales from the Decameron. Boccaccio.
72 The Color of Life. Haldeman-Julius.
102 Sherlock Holmes Tales. Doyle.
107 The Dream Woman. Collins.
145 Great Ghost Stories.
148 The Strength of the Strong. London.
151 The Man Who Would Be King. Kipling.

331 The Finest Story in the
332 The Man Who Was, and Other Stories. Kipling.
333 Mulvaney Stories. Kipling.
336 The Mark of the Beast. Kipling.
357 City of the Dreadful Night. Kipling.
161 The Country of the Blind. Wells.
182 Daisy Miller. James.
307 A Tillyloss Scandal. Barrie.
215 The Miraculous Revenge. Shaw.
232 The Three Strangers. Hardy.
277 The Man Without a Country. Hale.
285 Euphorian in Texas. Moore.
355 Aucassin and Nicolete. Lang.
363 Miggles and Other Stories. Harte.
397 Irish Fairy Tales.
420 Short Stories from the Spanish.
454 The Unworthy Coopers, etc. Haldeman-Julius.
334 Caught and Other Stories. Haldeman-Julius.
489 Great Yiddish Short Stories. Edited by Goldberg.
577 The Lifted Veil. Eliot.
583-584-585-586-587-588 The Jungle. 6 Vols. Sinclair.
590-591-592 The Millennium. 3 Vols. Sinclair.
594 The Overman. Sinclair.
595 The Happy Hypocrite. Beerbohm.

Fine Arts

476 A Handbook on the Gilbert and Sullivan Operas. Goldberg.
287 Whistler: The Man and His Work.
387 History of Painting. Sheehan.
403 History of Music. Sheehan.
466 A History of Sculpture. Sheehan.
468 A History of Architecture. Sheehan.
413 The Need for Art in Life. Holborn.
507 Richard Wagner: An Introduction. Goldberg.

(Note: In the operatic titles listed below, Mr. Theo. M. R. von Keler gives short biographical sketches, the story of the opera and helpful criticism of the music, illustrated by excerpts from the score.)

410 Die Walkuere. Wagner.
440 Cavalleria Rusticana. Mascagni.
441 I Pagliacci. Leoncavallo.
455 Richard Strauss's Salome.
456 Carmen. Bizet.
457 Lohengrin. Wagner.
458 Tannhauser. Wagner.
459 Das Rheingold. Wagner.
494 Siegfried. Wagner.
495 Rigoletto. Verdi.
569 Gotterdammerung. Wagner.

History

50 Paine's Common Sense.
34 The Mystery of the Iron Mask. Von Keler.
67 Church History. Tichenor.
83 Marriage: Its Past, Present and Future. Besant.
125 War Speeches of Woodrow Wilson. Edited by Smith.
126 History of Rome. Giles.
149 Historic Crimes and Criminals. Finger.
150 Lost Civilizations. Finger.
169 Voices From the Past. Tichenor.
174 Trial of William Penn.
185 History of Printing. Disraeli.
201 Satan and the Saints. Tichenor.
214 Speeches of Lincoln.
276 Speeches and Letters of George Washington.
286 When the Puritans Were in Power. Tichenor.
469 The Egypt of Yesterday: A History of Exploring and Excavation. Moritzen.
580 A History of Polar Exploration and Adventure. Van Sicklen.